



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

him to be the head over all to the Church" (Eph. i. 22). "Christ is the head of the Church" (Eph. v. 23); "and He is the head of the Church, who is the beginning, the first-born from the dead" (Col. i. 18). But we never read of Peter as the head of the Church, though Peter was then alive, and exercising his office as Apostle. That headship was not invented for some ages after.

For that Church Christ provided a ministry. 1000 years before, David had prophesied in the 68th psalm (67th Douay Bible), "Thou hast ascended on high; Thou hast led captivity captive; Thou hast received gifts for men." St. Paul has quoted this verse in his Epistle to the Ephesians, ch. iv., verse 8; and St. Paul thus explains the prophecy (verse 11); "And He gave some apostles, and some prophets, and some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers." How were these "gifts" given at His ascension? We find the answer at the end of St. Mark's Gospel—"And He said unto them, 'Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature'." So then, after the Lord had spoken to them, *He was received up into heaven* (Mark xvi. 15, 19). The Christian ministry, contained in the commission to the Apostles, was the gift which Christ gave to men when He ascended up into heaven, after His work on earth for man was finished.

That ministry was continued in the Church by those to whom it was committed.

The Apostles ordained presbyters by laying on of hands, with fasting and prayer, in every city where they converted men, and founded the Church.

At first the Apostles kept in their own hands the chief direction and government of the clergy in each Church which they founded; thus the Church of Ephesus was at first governed by many presbyters, all equal to each other; but Paul came to Miletus, a neighbouring city, and sent for the clergy of Ephesus to attend him there, that he might hold his visitation, exhort, and direct them (Acts xx. 17-38).

St. Paul concluded that beautiful charge by telling the clergy of Ephesus that "they should see his face no more" (Acts xx. 38). But he did not leave them without direction and government; he sent Timothy to take the charge of the Church of Ephesus, and gave him authority to ordain and to rule the clergy (1 Tim. i. 3; i. 18; iii. 15; iv. 11-16; v. 1; v. 19-22; vi. 13-20. 2 Tim. ii. 1, 2; iv. 1-5).

In like manner he appointed Titus in Crete (Titus i. 5-13; iii. 10).

That "ministry of reconciliation" in the Apostolic Church is thus described by St. Paul—"Now, then, we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us; we pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled unto God" (2 Cor. v. 20). Thus they exercised their office as God's appointed ambassadors and chosen instruments for the putting away of men's sins.

But we never find that the Apostles, in the exercise of this ministry, undertook themselves to forgive sins against God. When St. Peter, in the exercise of his apostolic office, convicted Simon Magus of sin, St. Peter did not say, "Make confession to me, and I will give you absolution," but he said, "Repent, therefore, of this thy wickedness, and pray God, if perhaps, the thought of thine heart may be forgiven thee" (Acts viii. 22); *this was St. Peter's notion of how he should exercise his power of "putting away sins."*

But when men sinned against the Church by offences which brought scandal upon it, *there the Church in that place, as well as the Apostle, had power to punish and to forgive* (1 Cor. v. 3, 5, 12, 13; and 2 Cor. ii. 6, 7, 10).

All Christians were directed to reverence and submit to this ministry—"We beseech you, brethren, to know them which labour among you, and are over you in the Lord, and admonish you; and to esteem them very highly in love for their works' sake" (1 Thess. v. 12, 13); "Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves; for they watch for your souls as they that must give account (Heb. xiii. 17). But this was accompanied by a solemn warning, that among the teachers and ministers of the Church "shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them" (Acts xx. 30); and with an awful direction to all Christians to hold such teachers accursed—"Though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed" (Gal. i. 8).

Therefore the original preaching of the Apostles is that touchstone by which Christians in after ages are to judge of the teaching of the ministers of the Church.

In that Apostolic Church St. Peter acted a very prominent part. We find him the preacher on the day of Pentecost (Acts ii. 14-40). When Peter and John were questioned before the council, we find Peter the spokesman. It was Peter who detected, and miraculously punished, the deceit of Ananias and Sapphira; and it was Peter who was chosen by God to be the first to admit Gentile converts to baptism (Acts x).

But wherever Peter stands forward prominently in the history of the Apostolic Church, it is in the preaching of the word, and the exercise of the ministry; not in the exercise of authority.

In the Church of that day, authority was exercised by the Apostles in common, acting with the counsel of the elders, and the consent of the Christian people.

When an order of deacons was to be instituted, it was "the twelve" that resolved and acted (Acts vi. 2); when

the Samaritans had received the gospel, it was "the Apostles which were at Jerusalem" who resolved on sending two of their number there; and Peter was one of the two whom they "sent" (Acts viii. 14, 15); when a question arose as to whether Peter had done right in admitting Gentile converts to baptism, Peter was called to account before the assembly at Jerusalem, and he defended himself, not by saying that the decision of all such questions was committed to him by Christ, but by proving that in this matter he had acted according to the will of God (Acts xi. 1-18); when a further question arose about the necessity of Gentile Christians keeping the Jewish law, Peter declared in the council "how that a good while ago God made choice among us, that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the word of the Gospel" (Acts xv. 7); but the sentence was pronounced by James (verse 19).

On one occasion when St. Peter assembled, and did not act with the same uprightness and vigour in declaring God's will about the Gentiles, St. Paul "withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed," and reproved him openly (Gal. ii. 11-14).

Thus it appears that St. Peter had no pre-eminence of authority in the Apostolic Church. Authority belonged to the Apostles in common; and to that authority, St. Peter, as well as others, was subject.

Yet a great pre-eminence St. Peter had, in being ever the first in action and in speech, in the earliest days of the Church.

Some Protestants have spoken of this as if it was merely the natural consequence of his being by nature a more forward and ready man than the other Apostles.

We cannot think this a sufficient account of it. We believe that the work and position of St. Peter in the first days of the Church was fore-ordained of God, and appointed and promised by Christ Himself.

St. Peter's work in the Church comprises two great facts.

He proclaimed the Gospel, and the opening of Christ's Church to the Jews, on the day of Pentecost (Acts ii.); and he opened the Church to the Gentiles, when he baptized Cornelius and his company (Acts xi.).

Of the latter he tells us that God Himself made choice of him for this special work. And we suppose the same was true of the former also.

When Christ said "The kingdom of God is at hand" (Mark i. 15), we believe that He had in view the establishment of the Gospel Church on earth. When Christ said to Peter, "I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven" (Matthew xvi. 19), we believe that Christ intended that St. Peter should open the Gospel Church to the Jews first, and after to the Gentiles.

In this view, the fact stands out in striking light, in the divinely inspired history of the Church, that when St. Peter had opened the Church to the Jew first, and after to the Gentile, and had recorded and affirmed in the Council at Jerusalem God's choice of him for that especial purpose—thenceforward that *history mentions St. Peter no more*, but goes on then exclusively with the history and labour of the great apostle of the Gentiles, to whom "the gospel of the uncircumcision was committed" (Gal. ii. 7); as if the special and peculiar work of Peter was completed in *opening the door to the Gentiles with the keys committed to him*; and St. Peter was thenceforward only "the apostle of the circumcision" (that is, of the Jews); while the apostleship of the Gentiles was now committed to Paul (Gal. ii. 7, 8).

We have endeavoured to give a brief, but true view of the Apostolic Church—the Church of the *FATHERS* of those whom men call fathers.

If we have dishonestly or ignorantly omitted any of those things which the Church of Rome now holds essential to the being of the Church, let some Roman Catholic priest or bishop stand forth and show in our pages those things, from the divinely inspired history of the Apostolic Church.

If none can dare to do so, then let our readers mark that the object of all our labours is, to set forth and to maintain the Church of Christ, as Christ and His Apostles established it in the world.

THE PRECEDENCY OF ROME.

In discussing with learned Roman Catholics the passages from ancient writers which they rely upon as proofs of the supremacy of Rome, it is of much importance to bear in mind what is the exact point in dispute between us—what it is that we admit, and what it is that our Roman Catholic brethren assert, and which we dispute and call upon them to prove by satisfactory evidence, Scriptural or historical. And, first, as to what Protestants admit—

"Long before the earliest epoch that can be fixed for modern history, and, indeed, to speak fairly, almost as far back as ecclesiastical testimony can carry us," writes the learned and judicious Protestant historian, Hallam, "the Bishop of Rome had been venerated as first in rank among the rulers of the Church."

Whoever considers the greatness of Rome, then, and for ages before, the capital of the world, its vast population, important and central position, commanding political influence, constant communication with its numerous provinces, and intellectual distinction, can be at no loss to understand why there was conceded to its bishops,

from a very early period, the first place of pre-eminence among the prelates of Christendom. The historian, Gibbon, who may be considered as a neutral in matters of difference between Protestants and Roman Catholics, however, prejudiced against the faith common to them both, says, "From every cause, either of a civil or of an ecclesiastical nature, it was easy to foresee that Rome must enjoy the respect, and would soon claim the obedience, of the provinces. The society of the faithful bards, a just proportion to the capital of the empire; and the Roman Church was the greatest, the most numerous; and, in regard of the west, the most ancient of all the Christian establishments, many of which had received their religion from the pious labours of her missionaries. Instead of one apostolic founder, the almost boast of Antioch, of Ephesus, or of Corinth, the banks of the Tiber were supposed to have been honoured with the preaching and martyrdom of the two most eminent among the Apostles; and the Bishops of Rome very prudently claimed the inheritance of whatsoever prerogatives were attributed either to the person or to the office of St. Peter. The Bishops of Italy and of the provinces were disposed to allow them a primacy of order and association (such was their very accurate expression) in the Christian aristocracy. But the power of a monarch was rejected with abhorrence; and the aspiring genius of Rome experienced from the natives of Asia and Africa a more vigorous resistance to her spiritual, than she had formerly done to her temporal, dominion."

There were many other causes also which conspired to secure to the Sea of Rome the primacy, or first place, in the episcopacy of Christendom; and they are so well summed up by an able modern writer, whom we have more than once referred to in our pages,* that we think we cannot do better than transcribe the following passage—"Rome was not only the sole see in the West to which tradition assigned an apostolic foundation, but for a long period the influence arising from this circumstance was increased by its freedom from the heresies by which the East was pervaded. Many martyrs had suffered in this city with wonderful constancy and courage. Bishops had been put to death almost as soon as they were installed in their office. And when the period of prosperity arrived, there were some who employed their wealth and influence very beneficially—charitable in distributing alms, and active in meeting the particular demands of the age: at one time mitigating the ferocity of the northern invaders; at another, sending our missionaries into the unreclaimed parts of Europe. The bishops of the early Church yielded a foremost place to those who would thus promote the common benefit, whether by their prominent position or the influence of personal character; but there was always a reservation of freedom, both by word and act; there was no authority claimed on the one side,¹ nor obedience rendered by the other. The civil divisions of the empire were, for the most part, followed in the ecclesiastical; not absolutely, because sometimes the will of the prince, and sometimes intrigue or convenience, introduced a different arrangement; but it was the ordinary rule, and the greatness of cities made the dignity of the bishop. The very order of the patriarchates is an evidence of the source in which their distinction originated. Rome stands at the head as the see of the imperial city, in which there was the great confluence of persons and causes from all parts, brought together to the centre of civil administration. In the words of M. Bunsen—"The gradually growing moral supremacy in the West originated in the political position of Rome as the centre of the world, and in the instinctive talent of government which has never ceased to distinguish the Romans." Alexandria occupied the second place, as being next in secular importance, until this established order was changed, because Constantinople, when it became the metropolis of the East, secured the corresponding rank for its bishop. There was no other reason why Alexandria should be placed above Antioch, or Constantinople above them both. It was on no account of antiquity that one see was preferred to another, for Antioch was more ancient than Rome,² nor through regard to apostolic foundation, or Alexandria would not have been preferred to Ephesus, Philippi, and other places. . . . Jerusalem, which St. Cyril calls the mother Church, which had James the Apostle for its first bishop, was *subject to the jurisdiction of Caesarea*, because it was low in temporal power. As long as the Exarch, who was the Emperor's representative, resided at Ravenna, the Archbishop of that city refused obedience to Rome; and while Milan retained its civil greatness its bishop was the rival of the Pope; but with their temporal prosperity both lost their ecclesiastical independence. It was just the same in the Church of North Africa, in which, for a time, the Bishops of Carthage exercised the rights of patriarchs, even before the name came into use."

* Decl. and Fall of the Roman Empire.—Vol. II., ch. 15, p. 233, London, 1821.

¹ Rev. Sanderson Robins on the Claims of the Roman Church.—P. 174. London: Longman and Co., 1855.

² This must, perhaps, be adopted with some modification; for we have already shown attempts at encroachment made on the independence of other Churches, by particular Pontiffs, at an early period, which were, however, resisted vigorously, proving conclusively that whatever authority was claimed, none was conceded.

To which we may add, that if there be any historical reason for considering St. Peter as at any time Bishop of Rome, there is the same ground for considering him as also Bishop of Antioch.

³ See the article on the Ancient Churches of Italy. CATHOLIC LATMAN, Vol. VI., p. 111.

* View of the state of Europe during the middle ages.—Vol. II., p. 168, ch. vii., pt. 1. London, 1866.

We have now placed our readers, we believe, in a position to estimate, at their true value, the passages relied on by our respected correspondent, Dr. Geraghty, and other learned advocates of the claims of Rome, as establishing the papal supremacy, but which we shall find prove really nothing more than the *precedency* which we, in common with nearly all Protestant historians and divines, admit was, in early times, conceded to the See of Rome. Hallam, in continuation of the passage already cited, describes it thus:—"The nature of this primacy is, doubtless, a very controverted subject. It is, however, reduced by some moderate (Roman) Catholics to little more than a *precedency* attached to the See of Rome in consequence of its foundation by the chief of the Apostles, as well as the dignity of the imperial city. A sort of general superintendence was admitted as an attribute of this primacy, so that the Bishops of Rome were entitled, and, indeed, lived to remonstrate, when any error or irregularity came to their knowledge, especially in the Western Churches, a greater part of which had been planted by them,⁶ and were connected, as it were, by filiation with the common capital of the Roman Empire and of Christendom."

We now revert to St. Cyprian, from whose epistles we gave so many extracts in our last number (p. 1).

In his 49th Epistle (Ben. ed.),⁷ addressed to Pope Cornelius, about A.D. 251 (and which, like all the others, is addressed to him as his *dear brother* Cornelius, not as his *holy father*), treating of the schismatic Novatus, one of the adherents of Novatian, he thus writes:—"It is he who, without my leave or knowledge, procured, by his own intrigue and management, Felicissimus, his adherent, to be ordained his deacon; and, sailing hence to Rome, carried with him the storm he had here been raising, and there endeavoured in like manner to subvert the Church by seducing a portion of the people from their clergy, and by breaking in upon that harmony and concord wherewith the brethren there had hitherto been united to each other. In fine, as Rome, in regard to her greatness, ought to have the *precedency* of Carthage, his attempts and crimes were greater at Rome than at Carthage; for there he took upon him to get a bishop made according to his own mind and liking, who here presumed no farther than to procure the ordination of a deacon, &c."⁸

This will enable us to understand also Cyprian's expressions in his other letters to the same Cornelius, in which he speaks in highly complimentary language of Rome as the "principal see," the "root and stem" of the Catholic Church,⁹ and other like expressions, which have been laid hold of and amplified by Roman Catholic writers, as if they established supremacy, though nothing was farther from St. Cyprian's opinion, as manifestly appears by the whole tenor of his writings. He fully admitted *precedency* and *primacy* if you will (though the word "primacy" never occurs in St. Cyprian's genuine writings),¹⁰ but such a primacy only as the Archbishop of York yields in the present day to the Archbishop of Canterbury, or the See of Dublin to that of Armagh.

That St. Cyprian recognized no *superior authority* in the See of Rome, and held firmly that his episcopal powers were not derived from that see, though it was the first or principal see, and from its position might, in a certain sense, be considered the natural centre of that unity for which he zealously laboured, is put beyond all doubt by a passage in the proceedings of the famous Council of Carthage, held in September, A.D. 256, at which eighty-five bishops of Africa, Numidia, and Mauritania attended in person, and two more by proxy, and which proceedings are preserved in the writings of Cyprian (see Ben. Ed. p. 697-8).

In the opening of the session of this Council, after the several letters which had passed between Jubaianus and himself,¹ concerning the baptism of heretics, had been

read, Cyprian thus addressed the assembly, in which it is stated, that in addition to the bishops, with their presbyters and deacons, a great number of the laity were also present: "Ye have heard, my beloved colleagues, what my brother and fellow-bishop Jubaianus hath written to me, and how he hath advised with me upon the subject now before us, concerning the baptism of heretics. My answer hath been likewise read to you; wherein I delivered the opinions which I had more than once already declared agreeable to my sentiments—viz., that heretics coming over to the Church ought to be baptised and sanctified with her holy baptism. Ye have likewise heard the reply of Jubaianus, which he, like a man of great modesty and true religion, sent to my letter, wherein you may observe him not only concurring in opinion with me, but making, moreover, his farther acknowledgments for the light and information received from me. What is, therefore, now farther incumbent on us, is only for each of us to deliver our own sentiments upon this question, and to preserve such a temper in them as not to take upon us the judging any man, or denouncing our anathemas against such as shall differ from us. I may presume there is no one of our brethren who will assume to himself an *episcopal authority* over those of his own order, or to be a bishop of bishops, or to drive any of his brethren, by *haughty menaces* or *tyrannical compulsion*, into his own persuasion; since every bishop hath equal liberty of judging and determining upon any question which comes before him, and he can no more be judged by than he can judge another. Wherefore, we should be all persuaded to wait for the judgment of our Lord Jesus Christ, from whom alone all our powers to govern His Church are derived to us, and who alone hath authority to call us to account for the use we make of them."²

Now, holding in mind that this Council was held in the latter end of A.D. 256, almost immediately after the letter of Cyprian to Pompeius, in which he complained so strongly of Pope Stephen,³ in relation to this very matter, there can be no doubt whatever that St. Cyprian, in speaking of one of his brethren "assuming to himself an episcopal authority over those of his own order, and attempting as a bishop of bishops to drive his brethren by haughty menaces and tyrannical compulsion into his own persuasion," meant no other than Pope Stephen himself, who was threatening, at least, to excommunicate, if he had not actually pronounced an excommunication against St. Cyprian and all who agreed with him in the disputed matter;⁴ and if so, can any one believe that St. Cyprian really held that the so-called supremacy of St. Peter had descended on Stephen as his legitimate and sole successor, and that he had absolute authority, by the divine right of Christ's own institution, to rule over the whole Church, as well the shepherds as the sheep of Christ's flock? Serious doubts have been, and might well be, entertained whether St. Cyprian ever wrote the passage in the 55th Epistle, on which Dr. Geraghty relies as showing that Rome was deemed the centre of unity; but we are willing, for the sake of argument, to deal with it as genuine, though in itself falling quite short of the object required, and still more so when contrasted with the plain words of Cyprian himself in the documents we have cited, as to the authenticity of which no doubt exists. Supposing that we have the very words of St. Cyprian, however, in this passage, they prove no more than that when writing about a matter wholly unconnected with any question of authority, he characterized Rome as the principal Church, from which sacerdotal unity took its rise (unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta est),⁵ which might be referable solely to the time of its traditional apostolic founders, and is quite a different thing from saying, "by which or by whose bishops the unity of the Church is preserved," which is the assertion made in the present times as the object and characteristic of the supremacy of Rome. We think further that the immediate context of the passage itself shows that St. Cyprian was referring to the whole Church at Rome, clergy and laity; for, after speaking of "the chair of St. Peter, the principal Church from whence sacerdotal unity sprung," he proceeds, "not considering that these were those Romans whose faith the Apostle (Paul) so much commended, and to whom, therefore, such infamous betrayers of it could never be supposed capable of gaining a favourable access."⁶

one Church," even while they were in the very act of differing from Pope Stephen. The words are, "Nos autem qui Ecclesie unus caput et radicem tenemus" (Oxford ed., p. 194. Ben. ed. p. 212), which throws much light upon the passage relied on from the 46th Epistle above referred to, "the root and matrix of the Catholic Church."

"Supervestit de hac ipsa re singuli quid sentiant proferamus, neminem judicantes, aut a jure communicationis aliquam, si diversum senserit, amoventes. Neque enim quisquam nostrum episcopum se esse episcoporum constituit, aut tyrannico terrore ad obsequendum necessitatibus collegas suos adigit, quando habet omnis episcopus pro licentia libertatis et potestatis sui arbitrium proprium, tamque iudicari a illo non potest quam a ipse potest alterum judicare. Sed expectamus universi iudicium Domini nostri Jesu Christi, qui unus et solus habet potestatem et promissionem in Ecclesia sui gubernatione et de acta novius iudicandi.—Cone. Carthag. Oper. S. Cypri. p. 697-8; Ben. ed. Venet. 1758.

² See our last number, p. 2.

³ Bishop Firmilian's letter to Cyprian, quoted in our last number, p. 2, shows how far Pope Stephen had denounced Cyprian, and with how little effect on either the Asian or African Churches.

⁴ Ben. ed. p. 206.

⁵ St. Jerome, in the preface to his 2nd book of commentaries, in the Epistle to the Galatians, says, "The faith of the city of Rome is praised: not because the Romans had any other faith than that which all the Churches of Christ possessed, but because their devotion and simplicity in believing was greater."—See Baluze's note in loco.

As to the passage from St. Cyprian's epistle to his people (ad plebem, No. 40, Benedictine Edition), as cited by Dr. Geraghty, it runs as follows:—"There is one God and one Christ; so is there but one Church and one chair, by the mouth of Christ, founded on Peter."

Supposing this were the accurate translation of what was certainly written by St. Cyprian, there is no necessary reference in it whatever to Rome, and, to our minds, it would only show that Cyprian was among the fathers who interpreted the xvi. Matthew, v. 18 (as to the rock on which the Church was to be built), of the person, and not of the faith, of St. Peter; leaving, however, no less than 44 fathers of the opposite opinion, as shown by us in Vol. V., p. 135.

It so happens, however, that we have the high authority of the Benedictine Editors to show that Cyprian was not here speaking of St. Peter at all, the passage in the Latin being "Super petram (Rock). Domini voce fundata," not "super Petrum (Peter), Dom. voce fundata." All the old editions, and no less than seventeen ancient codices, thus give the passage, as Baluze informs us in his note upon the words *super petram*, and he goes on to tell us that it was Manutius (who edited the Roman edition of 1564, and did not scruple, as we showed in our last number, p. 2, to omit from it altogether the letter to Pompeius, as disparaging to the papal authority) who introduced the reading *Petrum*, which Pamelius retained, though he himself bore witness that the other reading was found in the ancient manuscripts. We care not, however, whether Baluze and the Benedictine editors be right, or Manutius, inasmuch as it appears to us to be manifest that where there are no less than 17 old MSS. extant giving a different reading, nothing could be more unsafe than to assume as indisputable that St. Cyprian was referring at all to St. Peter in the passages in question. There is also much doubt of the genuineness of the quotation from the 52nd Epistle, "when the place of Fabian, that is, of Peter, was vacant;" some of the MSS. omit the words (id est locus Petri), "that is, of Peter," and Igitur says they probably crept into the text from a marginal gloss, and were never written by St. Cyprian; nor, he observes, will the sense of the author bear any other version.⁷

We are afraid of wearying our readers by following up our examination of the works of St. Cyprian any further at present; but as we feel pledged to Dr. Geraghty not to omit any of the passages from St. Cyprian on which he relied, we must again recur to this subject in a future number.

RELIGION OF PICTURES.—No. II.

OUR readers have, perhaps, not forgotten our article on "The Religion of Pictures," in our number for July last.

The Church of Rome is infallible, and can decide all controversies, and expound all mysteries; but to see the performance of such pretensions, we are obliged to have recourse to her pictures.

In the decrees of councils and of popes, the Church of Rome is cautious. The controversy about the Immaculate Conception was allowed to wear itself out through seven centuries, before the infallible decree came forth. Many other questions are still unsettled; such as, whose decision is infallible; whether saints hear our prayers or not; and, lastly, whether there be fire in purgatory or not.

This last is a question fit to kindle torments in the breasts of the living. What shall we see, and experience, and feel, after we pass through the valley of the shadow of death. Awful as death is in itself, what is it compared to the awful realities of the world of spirits, to which death itself is but the entrance? They who have experienced the dreadful phantoms of fever, the whirlpool of imagination which it creates, the awful tortures of disordered thought—and in such a condition have been agonized by thoughts of the fearful possibilities of suffering, in the pit seemingly open to their view—these already comprehend the dread realities of the question; as *all will*, sooner or later.

What, then, are the sufferings of the life to come?

Can those sufferings be avoided?

Can those who are saved by Christ hope to escape them? or must they prepare with trembling to bear their share in tortures unspeakable, which no human suffering can comprehend?

These are terrible thoughts, which Roman Catholics are made to tremble at, but for which they get no answer from the teaching of their Church, but doubtings more terrible than reality itself.

What is purgatory?

Is there fire in purgatory?

Who can tell?

Certainly not the Church of Rome.

At the Council of Florence, the Greeks, who strenuously denied that there was any fire in purgatory, were admitted to the communion of the Church of Rome on merely confessing "that there is a purgatory." It is certain, then, that the Church of Rome admitted as true believers in purgatory those who denied the existence of fire in that place.

⁷ Ben. ed. p. 132.

⁸ "Conjiciet aliqui manum Cypriani tantum scripsisse. Cum Fabianus locus et cathedra sacerdotalis vacaret. Nec sanè aliud quicquam patitur sensus auctoritas."—Oxford ed. p. 164, note.

⁶ St. Augustine seems distinctly to recognize that Africa owed her Christianity to Roman parentage, as might, indeed, have been presumed without evidence, from the local proximity of its chief city, Carthage, to the shores of Italy.

⁷ No. 52 in the Oxford edition.

⁸ "Placitum quoniam pro maxitudine sua debet Carthaginem Roma precedere, illic majora et graviora commisit."—Cyp. Oper. p. 156, Ben. ed. Venet. 1758. Baluze here adds, in a note—"Carthago appellata Roma apud Plinium, Velleium Paternulum, et Florum, dives opum ut ait Virgilius. . . Herodianus, lib. 7, ait, illam opibus, populi frequentia, vel magnitudine tantum Roma con-eedere. Transmaritima vicinis regionibus apud A. Gelium, l. 10, c. 27, et apud Auzanum in capite tertio prioris epistolae ad Eklusium, Glorium, et Felices. Vide Baluzianum, lib. 7, cap. 16."

The Latin word in the passage relied on by Dr. Geraghty, from Epistle 46, is not *mater* (mother), but *matrix* (literally womb), an expression often figuratively used as denoting the trunk from which the scene or off-shoots proceed. Dr. Geraghty cautiously translates it *matrix*, which is scarcely an English word, and as indefinite as the original Latin.

⁹ The passage in which it occurs in reference to St. Peter, in the book on "The Unity of the Church," is proved to be spurious, and interpolated, by not only Dr. James, on the Corruptions of the Fathers, part II., p. 113; but by Baluze himself, who in his note on the words "Loquitur Dominus," tells us, on the authority of Latinus, that the passage is not found in the seven Vatican codices, and on his own, that he had seen twenty-seven in which it was wanting. But poor Baluze died before his work was complete, and the Benedictine editors, while they dared not altogether suppress the note, took upon themselves, in spite of it, to replace the interpolated passage in the text, for which they can adduce no better reason than that the previous French editors and Baluze had done the same! Their naive confession, that they had found it necessary to alter not a few things in Baluze's notes, and that more would have been changed if it could conveniently have been done, is somewhat instructive as to the way in which writers are sometimes cooked when they do not suit the purposes of Rome!

¹⁰ In the Epistle of Cyprian to Jubaianus (No. 72), he speaks distinctly of the Churches of Africa "holding the head and root of the